



Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address: DOCTORS HOSPITAL AT RENAISSANCE 5501 SOUTH MCCOLL ROAD EDINBURG TX 78539	MFDR Tracking #: M4-07-3807-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #: LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 28	Date of Injury:
	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: The requestor did not submit a position summary.
Amount in Dispute: \$3080.00

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Paid 2-15-07 per MAR."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
11/29/2006	X170, Z652, U301	Outpatient Radiological Services	\$3080.00	\$0.00
Total Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on February 20, 2007.

- For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
 - X170-Pre-authorization was required, but not requested for this service per TWCC Rule 134.600.
 - Z652-Recommendation of payment has been based on a procedure code which best describes services rendered.
 - U301-This item was previously submitted and reviewed with notification of decision issued to payor/provider (Duplicate invoice).
- The respondent denied reimbursement for outpatient radiological services with EOB denial reason code "X170" on the initial EOB. The Division finds that on the reconsideration EOBs, the respondent did not maintain this denial reason upon reconsideration and payment of \$1166.54 was issued. A review of Division records does not support a preauthorization issue exists; therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed in accordance with Division rules and fee guidelines.
- The Respondent denied reimbursement based upon duplicate claim/service. The disputed service was a duplicate bill submitted for reconsideration of payment. The Respondent did not provide information/documentation of duplicate payments. Therefore, this payment denial reason has not been supported.
- Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(3), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, states that "Services such as outpatient physical therapy, radiological studies and laboratory studies are not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific services"...
- This dispute relates to outpatient radiological services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, which requires that, in the

absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available."

6. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all medical bill(s)... as originally submitted to the carrier and a copy of all medical bill(s) submitted to the carrier for reconsideration..." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include "the form DWC-60 table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form and manner prescribed by the Division." Review of the *Table of Disputed Services* finds that the requestor did not list the total amount in dispute in the appropriate column. The requestor also failed to submit the rationale for increased reimbursement. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not stated the reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii).
10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).
11. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
12. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of \$3080.00 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
 - The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment

of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”

- The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- The requestor did not discuss or support that the proposed methodology would ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the proposed methodology.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

13. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(A), §133.307(c)(2)(C), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §134.401
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

12/29/2010

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.